

REMARKS

In the Requirement for Election/Restriction dated March 26, 2010, the Examiner required an election under 35 USC §121 and §372 between what was characterized as the following inventions.

1. Group I. Claims 1, 2, 8, 11 through 18, 20 through 24, 36 through 40, 42 through 46, drawn to a method and system for facilitating the delivery of water to a plurality of cage level barrier type cages.
2. Group II. Claims 47 through 50, drawn to a method for filling and preparing a plurality of fluid-filled bags.
3. Group III. Claims 51 through 54, drawn to a method for providing a plurality of cage level barrier type cages and one or more sealed bags of fluids for use in the cages and a system comprising a plurality of cage level barrier type cages and one or more bags of fluid for use in the cages.

The Examiner states that the invention as grouped are distinct from each other and are unrelated inventions.


In response to the Examiner's request for election, Applicant hereby makes a provisional election to prosecute Group I (claims 1, 2, 8, 11 through 18, 20 through 24, 36 through 40, and 42 through 46) in the instant application. Applicant makes this provisional election with

traverse, and without prejudice to Applicant's right to pursue the subject matter of Groups II and III, e.g., and further file divisional applications.

In particular, each of the claims in Groups I, II and III are directed to a single inventive concept as it is defined under PCT Rule 13.1 because each have a similar or corresponding special technical feature. Specifically, each of the claims in Groups I, II and III are each directed to filling a plurality of bags with one or more fluids in a clean side of a laboratory site, each of the claims are directed to providing the bags of water at the clean side for use in a cage level barrier type cage and each of the claims are directed to inserting a valve into the sealed bags of water for dispensing water to one or more animals housed in a cage. Thus, this single novel inventive concept is set forth in each of the claims in this application and Groups I, II and III represent differing scopes of claims based on the same inventive concept. Furthermore, Applicants are aware of no prior art that shows these three features. Under the circumstances, it is believed that the restriction of all of the claims originally pending in this application into Groups I, II and III is improper. For this reason Applicant traverses the Restriction Requirement and requests that the Examiner withdraw the Restriction Requirement and examine each of the claims that are presently presented in this application.

No fee is deemed necessary by the Applicant in connection with the filing of this Response. If any additional fee is required, however, authorization is hereby given to charge the amount of such fee to Deposit Account No. 19-4709.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven B. Pokotilow, Esq.
Reg. No. 36,405
Attorney for Applicants
Stroock & Stroock & Lavan LLP
180 Maiden Lane
New York, New York 10038
(212) 806 5400